[10191/3334]

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant	:	Qiang QIU
Serial No.	:	10/655,955
Filed	:	September 4, 2003
For	:	METHOD AND DEVICE FOR ACQUIRING DRIVING DATA
Art Unit	:	2128
Examiner	:	Suzanne LO
Confirmation No.	:	8919

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

Date: June 11, 2008 Reg. No. 36,197

Signature: ______________________
Jong H. Lee

APPELLANT'S APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

SIR:

Applicant filed a Notice of Appeal dated January 9, 2008 (received at the PTO on January 14, 2008), appealing from the Final Office Action dated July 13, 2007, in which claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 10, 13-14, 17-18 and 20-21 of the above-identified application were finally rejected. This Brief is submitted by Applicant in support of his appeal.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in the present appeal is Robert Bosch GmbH of Stuttgart, Germany. Robert Bosch GmbH is the assignee of the entire right, title, and interest in the present application.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

No appeal or interference which will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on, the Board's decision in the pending appeal is known to exist to the undersigned attorney or is believed by the undersigned attorney to be known to exist to Applicant.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 10, 13-14, 17-18 and 20-21 are currently pending in the present application and are being appealed. Claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19 and 22 have been canceled. Among the appealed claims, claims 1, 10 and 14 are independent; claims 4-5 and 7-8 ultimately depend on claim 1; claim 13 depends on claim 10; and claims 17, 18, 20 and 21 ultimately depend on claim 14.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment has been filed subsequent to the Final Rejection mailed on July 13, 2007.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

With respect to independent claim 1, the present invention provides a method for analyzing driving data of at least two vehicles involved in a collision (Specification, p. 5, l. 6-9), comprising: .

calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles (Fig. 2, steps 40-48), the model including at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal (Fig. 2, steps 42-44; p. 2, l. 14-16; p. 7, l. 6-7) and a radar signal of an adaptive cruise control system of each of the at least two vehicles (p. 3, l. 7-8 & 19-23), wherein the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal includes a rotational-rate

signal of a yaw sensor (p. 2, l. 28-29), and wherein a time basis for the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal is provided by a real-time clock and recorded (p. 2, l. 19-20; p. 4, l. 15-19; p. 7, l. 1-3), and wherein the time basis is common to the at least two vehicles (p. 5, l. 6-7), and wherein the radar signal of the adaptive cruise control system and the time basis provided by the real-time clock are utilized to determine relative positions of the at least two vehicles (p. 3, l. 19-22; p. 5, l. 6-7; p. 7, l. 1-3); and

visually representing the three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles involved in the collision (p. 5, l. 7-9).

With respect to independent claim 10, the present invention provides a system for analyzing vehicle data of at least two vehicles involved in a collision, comprising:

a processing unit (Fig. 1, element 12) for calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model for the at least two vehicles (Fig. 2, steps 40-48), the model including at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal (Fig. 2, steps 42-44; p. 2, l. 14-16; p. 7, l. 6-7) and a radar signal of an adaptive cruise control system (Fig. 1, element 26) of each of the at least two vehicles (p. 3, l. 7-8 & 19-23), wherein the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal includes a rotational-rate signal of a yaw sensor (Fig. 1, element 28; p. 2, l. 28-29), and wherein a time basis for the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal is provided by a real-time clock (Fig. 1, element 16) and recorded (p. 2, l. 19-20; p. 4, l. 15-19; p. 7, l. 1-3), and wherein the time basis is common to the at least two vehicles (p. 5, l. 6-7), and wherein the radar signal of the adaptive cruise control system (Fig. 1, element 26) and the time basis provided by the real-time clock (Fig. 1, element 16) are utilized to determine relative positions of the at least two vehicles (p. 3, l. 19-22; p. 5, l. 6-7; p. 7, l. 1-3); and

a display device configured to visually represent the three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles involved in the collision (p. 5, l. 7-9).

With respect to independent claim 14, the present invention provides a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium (p. 5, l. 11-16) having a program-code that when executed on one of a computer and a processing unit results in a performance of:

calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model for at least two vehicles involved in a collision (Fig. 2, steps 40-48), the model including at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal (Fig. 2, steps 42-44; p. 2, l. 14-16; p. 7, l. 6-7) and a radar signal of an adaptive cruise control system of each of the at least two vehicles (p. 3, l. 7-8 & 19-23), wherein the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal includes a rotational-rate signal of a yaw sensor (p. 2, l. 28-29), and wherein a time basis for the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal is provided by a real-time clock and recorded (p. 2, l. 19-20; p. 4, l. 15-19; p. 7, l. 1-3), and wherein the time basis is common to the at least two vehicles (p. 5, l. 6-7), and wherein the radar signal of the adaptive cruise control system and the time basis provided by the real-time clock are utilized to determine relative positions of the at least two vehicles (p. 3, l. 19-22; p. 5, l. 6-7; p. 7, l. 1-3); and

visually representing the three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles involved in the collision (p. 5, l. 7-9).

VI. <u>GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL</u>

The following grounds of rejections are presented for review on appeal in this case:

(A) Whether pending claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 14 and 17-18 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,933 ("Bague") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,581,464 ("Woll").

(B) Whether pending claims 7 and 20 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,933 ("Bague") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,581,464 ("Woll") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,074 ("Hathout").

(C) Whether pending claims 8, 13 and 21 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,933 ("Bague") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,581,464 ("Woll") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,239 ("Rayner").

VII. ARGUMENTS

A. Rejection of Claims 1, 4-5, 10, 14 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-5, 10, 14 and 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,933 ("Bague") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,581,464 ("Woll"). Applicant respectfully submits that remaining claims 1, 4-5, 10, 14 and 17-18 are patentable over the applied references, for at least the reasons set forth below.

In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show, *inter alia*, that there is some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify or combine the references, and that, when so modified or combined, the prior art teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. §2143. In addition, as clearly indicated by the Supreme Court, it is "important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements" in the manner claimed. See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007). In this regard, the Supreme Court further noted that "rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." Id., at 1396. To the extent that the Examiner may be relying on the doctrine of inherent disclosure in support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner must provide a " basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristics necessarily flow from the teachings of the applied art." (See M.P.E.P. § 2112; emphasis in original; see also Ex parte Levy, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990)).

Independent claim 1 recites, in relevant parts, a "calculating **a three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles**, the model including at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal and a radar signal of an adaptive cruise control system **of each of the at least two vehicles**, wherein the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal includes **a rotational-rate signal of a yaw sensor**, and wherein **a time basis** for the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one

lateral-motion-dynamics signal is **provided by a real-time clock** and recorded, and wherein **the time basis is common to the at least two vehicles**, and wherein **the radar signal of the adaptive cruise control system and the time basis provided by the real-time clock are utilized to determine relative positions of the at least two vehicles**; and **visually representing the three-dimensional, kinematic model** of the at least two vehicles involved in the collision." Amended independent claims 10 and 14 recite substantially similar features as the above-recited features of claim 1.

In support of the rejection, the Examiner contends that Bague teaches "calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model (column 10, lines 48-52 and column 14, lines 54-61) of at least two vehicles (column 15, lines 13-22)." However, nothing in the cited sections of Bague actually supports the Examiner's contention. First, column 10, lines 48-52 of Bague merely mentions **measuring acceleration data of a single vehicle**, which has nothing to do with any calculation, let alone "**calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model**." Second, column 14, lines 54-61 of Bague merely mentions that the "computer analyzes the data [recorded image data and operational data from the accident data recorder] and visually, continuously shows on the screen of a monitor display the speed, direction, and position of the automotive vehicle and the image view from the video/audio camera . . . [which] makes it possible to reproduce a continuous image of the state of the automotive vehicle up to the crash." The disclosure of column 14, lines 54-61 of Bague has nothing to do with "**calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model**" of at least two vehicles; instead, this section of Bague merely suggests **visually reproducing** "on the screen of a monitor display the **speed, direction, and position of the automotive vehicle and the image view** from the video/audio camera." Third, the disclosure of column 15, lines 13-22 of Bague has nothing to do with **calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model of at least two vehicles**; instead, this section merely suggests the possibility of providing "a second **video/audio camera** aimed through the rear window of the car to . . . **record a traffic accident of the car** in more detail, and thereby analyze the rear-end accident in more detail." To the extent the Examiner is implicitly contending that mere recording of a rear-end traffic accident using a video/audio camera satisfies the claimed feature of **calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model of at least two vehicles**, there is simply no logical basis for this contention.

In contrast to the claimed invention, Bague is clearly not directed to "calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model of at least two vehicles"; instead, Bague merely teaches

playing back the recorded operational data of the vehicle and the visual image recorded from a single vehicle.

Independent of the above, to the extent the Examiner appears to contend[1] that column 4, lines 57-64 of Woll teaches "the time basis [that is common to the two vehicles] provided by the real-time clock" is utilized to determine relative positions of the at least two vehicles, this contention is obviously incorrect. The "clock" mentioned in column 4, lines 57-64 of Woll is a data transfer clock for the RAM card receptacle 21 within the Event Recording Apparatus 5, which is not only completely unrelated to the real-time clock that provides the time basis common to the two vehicles, but also completely contradictory to the Examiner's other contention that **a GPS** (as disclosed in column 15, lines 24-26 of Bague) is "the time basis [that is common to the two vehicles] provided by the real-time clock" (see Final Office Action, page 2, paragraph 2).

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1, 10 and 14, as well as their dependent claims 4, 5 and 17-18, clearly cannot be rendered obvious by Bague and Woll. Accordingly, reversal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

B. Rejection of Claims 7 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,933 ("Bague") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,581,464 ("Woll") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,074 ("Hathout"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 20 are not rendered obvious by the applied references, for at least the reasons set forth below.

In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show, *inter alia*, that there is some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the

---

[1] The Examiner refers to sections of Bague on page 3, second paragraph, of the Final Office Action, but the cited sections of Bague are not related to the Examiner's contentions.

art, to modify or combine the references, and that, when so modified or combined, the prior art teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. §2143. In addition, as clearly indicated by the Supreme Court, it is "important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements" in the manner claimed. See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007). In this regard, the Supreme Court further noted that "rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." Id., at 1396. To the extent that the Examiner may be relying on the doctrine of inherent disclosure in support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner must provide a " basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristics necessarily flow from the teachings of the applied art." (See M.P.E.P. § 2112; emphasis in original; see also Ex parte Levy, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990)).

Claims 7 and 20 depend on claims 1 and 14, respectively. In support of the rejection of claims 7 and 20, the Examiner cites Hathout as teaching the feature of "utilizing a rotation-rate signal of an ESP system." However, as discussed above, the overall teachings of Bague and Woll clearly do not render parent claims 1 and 14 obvious. In addition, the teachings of Hathout clearly do not remedy the deficiencies of Bague and Woll as applied against parent claims 1 and 14, i.e., the overall teachings of Bague, Woll and Hathout clearly fail to teach or suggest the claimed features of "calculating **a three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles**, the model including at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal and a radar signal of an adaptive cruise control system **of each of the at least two vehicles**, wherein the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal includes **a rotational-rate signal of a yaw sensor**, and wherein **a time basis** for the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal is **provided by a real-time clock** and recorded, and wherein **the time basis is common to the at least two vehicles**, and wherein **the radar signal of the adaptive cruise control system and the time basis provided by the real-time clock are utilized to determine relative positions of the at least two vehicles**; and **visually representing the three-dimensional, kinematic model** of the at least two vehicles involved in the collision."

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 14, as well as their dependent claims 7 and 20, are not rendered obvious by the combination of Bague, Woll and Hathout. Reversal of the obviousness rejection is requested.

C. Rejection of Claims 8, 13 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8, 13 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,246,933 ("Bague") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,581,464 ("Woll") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,239 ("Rayner"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 13 and 21 are not rendered obvious by the applied references, for at least the reasons set forth below.

In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show, *inter alia*, that there is some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify or combine the references, and that, when so modified or combined, the prior art teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations. M.P.E.P. §2143. In addition, as clearly indicated by the Supreme Court, it is "important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements" in the manner claimed. See KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007). In this regard, the Supreme Court further noted that "rejections on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." Id., at 1396. To the extent that the Examiner may be relying on the doctrine of inherent disclosure in support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner must provide a " basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristics necessarily flow from the teachings of the applied art." (See M.P.E.P. § 2112; emphasis in original; see also Ex parte Levy, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990)).

Claims 8, 13 and 21 depend on claims 1, 10 and 14, respectively. In support of the rejection of claims 8, 13 and 21, the Examiner cites Rayner as teaching the feature of

"outputting a message based on the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal in response to a predeterminable event." However, as discussed above, the overall teachings of Bague and Woll clearly do not render parent claims 1, 10 and 14 obvious. In addition, the teachings of Rayner clearly do not remedy the deficiencies of Bague and Woll as applied against parent claims 1, 10 and 14, i.e., the overall teachings of Bague, Woll and Rayner clearly fail to teach or suggest the claimed features of "calculating **a three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles**, the model including at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal and a radar signal of an adaptive cruise control system **of each of the at least two vehicles**, wherein the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal includes **a rotational-rate signal of a yaw sensor**, and wherein **a time basis** for the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal is **provided by a real-time clock** and recorded, and wherein **the time basis is common to the at least two vehicles**, and wherein **the radar signal of the adaptive cruise control system and the time basis provided by the real-time clock are utilized to determine relative positions of the at least two vehicles**; and **visually representing the three-dimensional, kinematic model** of the at least two vehicles involved in the collision."

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 10 and 14, as well as their dependent claims 8, 13 and 21, are not rendered obvious by the combination of Bague, Woll and Rayner.

VIII. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the final rejections of claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 10, 13-14, 17-18 and 20-21 should be reversed.

Claims Appendix, Evidence Appendix and Related Proceedings Appendix sections are found in the attached pages.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

(R. No. 36,197)

Dated: June 11, 2008

By: JONG LEE for Gerard Messina

Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646

APPENDIX TO APPELLANT'S APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37

CLAIMS APPENDIX

The claims involved in this appeal, claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 10, 13-14, 17-18 and 20-21, in their current form after entry of all amendments presented during the course of prosecution, are set forth below:

1. A method for analyzing driving data of at least two vehicles involved in a collision, comprising:

calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles, the model including at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal and a radar signal of an adaptive cruise control system of each of the at least two vehicles, wherein the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal includes a rotational-rate signal of a yaw sensor, and wherein a time basis for the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal is provided by a real-time clock and recorded, and wherein the time basis is common to the at least two vehicles, and wherein the radar signal of the adaptive cruise control system and the time basis provided by the real-time clock are utilized to determine relative positions of the at least two vehicles; and

visually representing the three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles involved in the collision.

4. The method as recited in Claim 1, wherein:

the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal includes at least one of speed signals of all wheels, vehicular-speed signals, longitudinal-acceleration signals, and a GPS signal.

5. The method as recited in Claim 1, wherein:

the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal further includes at least one of lateral-acceleration signals, and steering-angle signals.

7. The method as recited in Claim 1, wherein a rotational-rate signal of an ESP system is utilized as the rotational-rate signal of the yaw sensor.

8. The method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising:

outputting a message based on the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal in response to a predeterminable event.

10. A system for analyzing vehicle data of at least two vehicles involved in a collision, comprising:

a processing unit for calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model for the at least two vehicles, the model including at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal and a radar signal of an adaptive cruise control system of each of the at least two vehicles, wherein the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal includes a rotational-rate signal of a yaw sensor, and wherein a time basis for the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal is provided by a real-time clock and recorded, and wherein the time basis is common to the at least two vehicles, and wherein the radar signal of the adaptive cruise control system and the time basis provided by the real-time clock are utilized to determine relative positions of the at least two vehicles; and

a display device configured to visually represent the three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles involved in the collision.

13. The device as recited in Claim 10, further comprising:

a transmission device for transmitting a message.

14. A computer program stored on a computer-readable medium having a program-code that when executed on one of a computer and a processing unit results in a performance of:

calculating a three-dimensional, kinematic model for at least two vehicles involved in a collision, the model including at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal and a radar signal of an adaptive cruise control system of

each of the at least two vehicles, wherein the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal includes a rotational-rate signal of a yaw sensor, and wherein a time basis for the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal is provided by a real-time clock and recorded, and wherein the time basis is common to the at least two vehicles, and wherein the radar signal of the adaptive cruise control system and the time basis provided by the real-time clock are utilized to determine relative positions of the at least two vehicles; and

visually representing the three-dimensional, kinematic model of the at least two vehicles involved in the collision.

17. The computer program as recited in Claim 14, wherein:

the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal includes at least one of speed signals of all wheels, vehicular-speed signals, longitudinal-acceleration signals, and a GPS signal.

18. The computer program as recited in Claim 14, wherein:

the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal further includes at least one of lateral-acceleration signals and steering-angle signals.

20. The computer program as recited in Claim 14, wherein a rotational-rate signal of an ESP system is utilized as the rotational-rate signal of the yaw sensor.

21. The computer program as recited in Claim 14, an execution of the computer program further comprising:

outputting a message based on the at least one linear-motion-dynamics signal and the at least one lateral-motion-dynamics signal in response to a predeterminable event.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

In the present application, there has been no evidence submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132, or other evidence entered by the Examiner and relied upon by Appellants in the present appeal.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

No appeal or interference which will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on, the Board's decision in the pending appeal is known to exist.